Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/682,699	BRITTAIN, JEAN HELEN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tiffany A Fetzner	2859
All Participants:	Status of Applicati	on:
(1) <u>Tiffany A Fetzner</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>J. Mark Wilkinson Reg. No. 48,865</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 26 May 2004	Time: <u>3pm</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	Applicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: Status of the double patenting rejections, the rejections of	f Hajnal, the antecedent basis ob	jection to claim 1
Claims discussed: claims 1 and 22		
Prior art documents discussed: Hajnal anf the fact that claim 22 did not mention continuous	us motion in a first direction.	
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHA	AT WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a septidirectly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a septidid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief success</li> </ul>	on. The examiner will provide arate record of the substance	a written summary of the substane of the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Ap	plicant/Applicant's Represent	ative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's attorney to request permission to do an examiner's amendment to the after-final claims of May 18th 2004, specifically claims 1, and 22 in order to place the application in condition for allowance. The examiner's amendment to claim 1 corrects an antecedent basis problem, while the amendment to clain 22 clarifies that the continuous repositioning without interruption of motion occurs "in the first direction". The examiner amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure and do not constitute new matter. The attorney agreed to the examiner's amendment, in order to place the application in condition for allowance. The examiner notified applicant that the double patenting rejections would be rescinded in this application, but that the double patenting rejections in child application 10/235,454 would now become formal double patenting rejections, as opposed to provisional double patenting rejections. The attorney indicated that he understood and expected that. The attorney also noted that due to the fact that the instant application and the child case are not commonly owned and not commonly assigned that he was aware that a terminal disclaimer would not overcome the double patenting rejections in the child case. The examiner was thanked for her time, in helping to place the instant application in condition for allowance. The updated prior art search of the May 18th 2004 after-final amendment indicated no new prior art, given that applicant has sworn behind the date of April 9th 2001 of the Kruger et al., reference. The MAy 18th 2004 after-final amendment has been marked okay to enter by the examiner. The drawings filed October 5th 2001 have been approved by the examiner. The examiner also notified the attorney that a PTO 948 form, from the official draftsperson would also be attached to the office action containing the examiner's amendment. Applicant agreed to resubmit NEW FORMAL drawings if the official draftsperson required new drawings.